

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To: BCF LLP 1100, Rene-Levesque Blvd. West 25th Floor MONTREAL, Quebec Canada, H3B 5C9		<h2 style="margin: 0;">PCT</h2> <p style="margin: 5px 0;">WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY</p> <p style="margin: 5px 0;">(PCT Rule 43bis.1)</p>																									
Applicant's or agent's file reference 10660-063		FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below																									
International application No. PCT/CA2006/000772	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 12 May 2006 (12-05-2006)	Priority date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 12 May 2005 (12-05-2005)																									
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC: <i>B01J 20/26</i> (2006.01), <i>A61L 15/60</i> (2006.01), <i>A61L 15/28</i> (2006.01)																											
Applicant ARCHER-DANIELS-MIDLAND COMPANY ET AL																											
<p>1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items :</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 10%;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 20%;">Box No. I</td> <td>Basis of the opinion</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. II</td> <td>Priority</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. III</td> <td>Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. IV</td> <td>Lack of unity of invention</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. V</td> <td>Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VI</td> <td>Certain documents cited</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VII</td> <td>Certain defects in the international application</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VIII</td> <td>Certain observations on the international application</td> </tr> </table> <p>2. FURTHER ACTION</p> <p>If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.</p> <p>If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.</p> <p>For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.</p> <p>3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.</p>				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the opinion	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the opinion																									
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority																									
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability																									
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention																									
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement																									
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited																									
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application																									
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application																									
Name and mailing address of the ISA/CA Canadian Intellectual Property Office Place du Portage I, C114 - 1st Floor, Box PCT 50 Victoria Street Gatineau, Quebec K1A 0C9 Facsimile No.: 001(819)953-2476		Date of completion of this opinion 01 August 2006 (01-08-2006)	Authorized officer Charles Greenough (819) 994-0243																								

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/CA2006/000772

Box No. I

Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

☒ the international application in the language in which it was filed

☐ a translation of the international application into _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

☐ a sequence listing

☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

☐ on paper

☐ in electronic form

c. time of filing/furnishing

☐ contained in the international application as filed.

☐ filed together with the international application in electronic form

☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3 ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statement that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments :

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/CA2006/000772

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis:1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims <u>1-23</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims <u>1-23</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1-23</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO

2. Citations and explanations :

Claims 1-23 are novel and comply with Article 33(2) of the PCT. The subject matter of claims 1-23 is considered to be novel since the prior art does not fairly suggest absorbent materials comprising absorbent boronate galactomannan complexes comprising a hydrophobic group.

Claims 1-23 comply with Article 33(3) of the PCT. The subject matter of claims 1-23 is considered to involve an inventive step since the prior art does not fairly suggest absorbent materials comprising absorbent boronate galactomannan complexes.

The subject matter of Claims 1-23 is considered to be industrially applicable and thus complies with the requirements of Article 33(4) of the PCT.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/CA2006/000772

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made :

Claims 22 and 23 do not comply with Article 6 of the PCT for being directed to the desired result rather than to the combination necessary to achieve that result as described in the description.

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:
BCF LLP
1100, Rene-Levesque Blvd. West
25th Floor
MONTREAL, Quebec
Canada, H3B 5C9

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43*bis*.1)

Date of mailing 5 September 2006 (05-09-2006)
(day/month/year)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
10660-063

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/CA2006/000772

International filing date (day/month/year)
12 May 2006 (12-05-2006)

Priority date (day/month/year)
12 May 2005 (12-05-2005)

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
IPC: *B01J 20/26* (2006.01), *A61L 15/60* (2006.01), *A61L 15/28* (2006.01)

Applicant
ARCHER-DANIELS-MIDLAND COMPANY ET AL

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items :

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. I | Basis of the opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. II | Priority |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Rule 43 <i>bis</i> .1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability, citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1*bis*(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/CA
Canadian Intellectual Property Office
Place du Portage I, C114 - 1st Floor, Box PCT
50 Victoria Street
Gatineau, Quebec K1A 0C9
Facsimile No.: 001(819)953-2476

Date of completion of this opinion
01 August 2006 (01-08-2006)

Authorized officer
Charles Greenough (819) 994-0243

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/CA2006/000772

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

☒ the international application in the language in which it was filed

☐ a translation of the international application into _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of :
 - a. type of material

☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material

☐ on paper
☐ in electronic form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing

☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in electronic form
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
- 3 ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statement that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments :

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No. .
PCT/CA2006/000772

Box No. V. Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims <u>1-23</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims <u>1-23</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1-23</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO

2. Citations and explanations :

Claims 1-23 are novel and comply with Article 33(2) of the PCT. The subject matter of claims 1-23 is considered to be novel since the prior art does not fairly suggest absorbent materials comprising absorbent boronate galactomannan complexes comprising a hydrophobic group.

Claims 1-23 comply with Article 33(3) of the PCT. The subject matter of claims 1-23 is considered to involve an inventive step since the prior art does not fairly suggest absorbent materials comprising absorbent boronate galactomannan complexes.

The subject matter of Claims 1-23 is considered to be industrially applicable and thus complies with the requirements of Article 33(4) of the PCT.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/CA2006/000772

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made :

Claims 22 and 23 do not comply with Article 6 of the PCT for being directed to the desired result rather than to the combination necessary to achieve that result as described in the description.